

Application No. 09/903,991  
Reply to Office Action of: January 24, 2007

## **REMARKS**

### **Telephone Interview**

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for extending the courtesy of a telephone interview on October 5, 2007. The purpose of the interview was to discuss a possible amendment to clarify the claimed invention with respect to Boden according to comments provided by the Examiner earlier in prosecution of this application. In the advisory action dated December 6, 2006, the Examiner indicated that the claims are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation and as a result notes that the claims do not clearly recite that the public host is actually the client machine. The Examiner also states that specifying the public host as the client machine would clearly define the scope of the claimed limitation and possibly overcome the cited prior art. The amendments above have been presented to clarify that the public host is a client using the public network per the Examiner's comments. As discussed in the telephone interview, the above-amendments clarify the distinctions over the Boden reference. Accordingly, Applicant believes that the claims are in condition for allowance.

### **Status of Application**

As noted above, a Notice of Appeal was timely filed on April 20, 2007, a Brief on Appeal was filed on June 20, 2007, and a Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief was mailed on August 3, 2007. Applicant advises that a request for a two-month extension of time and a request for continued examination are being filed concurrently herewith. As such, it is believed that the present amendment is eligible to be entered and prosecution should be reopened and continue on the basis of such amendment.

### **Claim Amendments**

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the public host is a client using the public network. As noted above, this clarification has been made in response to the Examiner's comments outlined in the Advisory Action dated December 6, 2006. Claim 1 has also been amended to be from the perspective of the client and software module only. Claims 4 and 12-16 have been amended to be consistent with the new terminology in claim 1 and to replace "Clam" with "claim" where appropriate.

Claim 17 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 and, as suggested by the Examiner, to indicate that the software module, when executed, performs steps similar to those recited in claim 1. Claims 18 and 19 have been amended similar to claims 4 and 12-16 where appropriate.

New claims 20-26 have been added which are directed to a computer readable medium

Application No. 09/903,991  
Reply to Office Action of: January 24, 2007

comprising computer executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claims 1, 4 and 12-16.

No new subject matter is believed to have been added by way of these amendments.

#### **Claim Rejections**


Claims 1, 4 and 12-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boden (US 6,832,322). As noted above, claims 1 and 17 have been amended to clarify that the public host is a client (or client device) using the public network. Boden does not teach a software module at the client that performs the steps recited in claims 1 and 17 (and new claim 20). The Examiner indicated in the telephone interview that such amendments overcome the Boden reference. As such, it is believed that claims 1, 4 and 12-19 as amended are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

#### **Summary**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes that claims 1, 4, and 12-26 clearly and patentably distinguish over Boden and are in condition for allowance.

Applicant requests early reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Brett J. Slaney  
Agent for Applicant  
Registration No. 58,772

Date: October 9, 2007

BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP  
Suite 2800, P.O. Box 25  
199 Bay Street, Commerce Court West  
Toronto, Ontario M5L 1A9  
CANADA

Tel: 416-863-2518  
BS/